

**MINUTES  
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION  
COUNCIL OF WASHINGTON**

**December 6, 2004 Regular Meeting**  
925 Plum Street S.E., Building 4, Room 308  
Olympia, Washington 1:30 p.m.

**ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER**

CHAIR LUCE: The December 6, 2004 meeting of the Washington State Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council is called to order. Clerk will call the roll.

**ITEM 2: ROLL CALL**

**EFSEC Council Members**

**Community, Trade & Economic Development**

**Department of Ecology**

**Department of Fish & Wildlife**

**Department of Natural Resources**

**Kittitas County**

**Chair**

Richard Fryhling

Hedia Adelman

Chris Towne

Tony Ifie

(via phone) Patti Johnson

Jim Luce

MR. MILLS: Mr. Sweeney, Utilities and Transportation Commission, is excused. There is a quorum.

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

**EFSEC STAFF AND COUNSEL**

Allen Fiksdal

Mike Mills

Irina Makarow

Shaun Linse, Court Reporter

**EFSEC GUESTS**

Darrel Peebles – Attorney for Kittitas Valley &  
Wild Horse Projects

Mot Hedges – Energy Northwest

Doug Culver – Energy Northwest

Alan Harger – DOT

Troy Gagliano – Renewable Northwest  
Project (via telephone)

Lauri Vigue – Dept of Fish & Wildlife

John Lane – Counsel for the Environment

David Bricklin, Attorney for Bricklin,

Newman & Dold (via telephone)

### ITEM NO. 3: ADOPTION OF THE PROPOSED AGENDA

CHAIR LUCE: We have before us the proposed agenda. Have Councilmembers had an opportunity to review and consider the proposed agenda? Are there any changes?

MR. IFIE: I would like to propose an addition, under EFSEC rules.

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

MR. IFIE: I would like to add future rule considerations.

CHAIR LUCE: Future rule considerations is hereby added under EFSEC rules. Anyone else?

MS. ADELSMAN: Rule changes.

CHAIR LUCE: Future rule changes, future rule additions. Okay. Anybody have any objection? Hearing no objection, so ordered. Any others? The proposed agenda is adopted as amended by Councilmember Ifie.

### ITEM NO. 4: MINUTES

CHAIR LUCE: Next is minutes. Adoption of the minutes for October 11, October 26, and November 1, 2004 meetings. Have Councilmembers had an opportunity to review the minutes?

MS. TOWNE: I reviewed and edited all of them and got them back to Mariah before her departure. Whether they were incorporated, I cannot say.

CHAIR LUCE: I'm sure those incorporations will be made at the appropriate time and in due course.

MS. TOWNE: They were all technical in nature.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Do I have a motion to adopt the minutes?

MR. IFIE: I so move.

CHAIR LUCE: Second.

MS. ADELSMAN: Second.

CHAIR LUCE: Questions? All in favor?

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

MR. FIKSDAL: And, Mr. Chair, that was for all the minutes.

CHAIR LUCE: That was for all of the minutes, yes.

### ITEM NO. 5: PROJECT UPDATES

<b><i>Wild Horse Wind Power Project</i></b>	<b><i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i></b>
---	------------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: Project updates. Irina, do you have an update for the Wild Horse Wind Project?

MS. MAKAROW: For the Wild Horse Wind Power Project, the only update is actually from the Applicant on their efforts to resolve the land use inconsistency issues with Kittitas County and, Mr. Darrel Peeples, maybe you can come up and brief the Council on that. For the County, is Mr. Jim Hurson on the line?

MR. PEEPLES: Jim, are you there?

MS. MAKAROW: Apparently not.

MR. PEEPLES: Is Darryl Piercy there?

CHAIR LUCE: Anyone other than Patti there?

MR. FIKSDAL: David Bricklin is on the line and Tony Gagliano is on the line.

MR. PEEPLES: Essentially I have not been directly involved in it, but it is my understanding -- I was hoping Jim was going to be here to fill in anything I missed. But there has been submitted a development agreement that's been the subject of a lot of work for the past two, three, actually past probably two months or so. So that has been submitted to the County. It was worked on between the County and the Applicant. It's the Applicant's document though. So that has been submitted, I believe last Friday, and everything is proceeding, with probably a hearing sometime in January with the County.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

MR. PEEPLES: That's all I know. I was hoping Jim would be on the phone.

CHAIR LUCE: All right. Any other comments by parties on the phone? Mr. Bricklin?

MR. BRICKLIN: No comments.

CHAIR LUCE: Any comments by anyone else, any other parties, interveners? No comments. All right. Moving on to Patti, do you have anything to add?

MS. JOHNSON: No.

<b><i>BP Cherry Point</i></b>	<b><i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i></b>
-------------------------------	------------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: BP Cherry Point.

MS. MAKAROW: Just two short updates. In your packets you'll find a record of decision issued by Bonneville Power Administration regarding the request for transmission by the BP Cherry Point Co-Generation Project. If you do get into it and read it, you will note that there is one error in here where they actually refer to the Oregon Energy Facility Siting Council. We've alerted them to that, and they've actually already corrected it and issued another one. But for the sake of saving paper I did not include it. The other item is that we're still waiting for the Governor's office as to when the Governor will act on the application.

MS. TOWNE: Is the 17th the drop-dead date?

MR. FIKSDAL: The 26th of December would be the 60-day date.

<b><i>Columbia Generating Station</i></b>	<b><i>Mike Mills, EFSEC</i></b>
---	---------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: Okay. That's good. Thank you very much. We have next the Columbia Generating Station, and I'll turn this over to Mike.

#### **NOC AIR PERMIT REVISION – STANDBY DIESEL GENERATOR**

MR. MILLS: We have several items for Columbia, and Mot Hedges is here from Energy Northwest. The first item is Energy Northwest's request for consideration of a revision to their synthetic minor air permit<sup>1</sup> for the Columbia Generating Station. They're considering adding an additional standby diesel generator, and I believe Mot is prepared to review their request and then staff will have a recommendation.

MR. HEDGES: Yes, we have a 40 kW package diesel that we want to add to the site. This would be used to supplement our supply power to battery chargers during an outage when we want to do maintenance on our breaker system. In order to take down one of the electrical distribution systems, this diesel would be run probably about 40 hours a year, and it would supply power to essential battery chargers. As required, we submitted our Notice of Construction (NOC) revised application, and I can answer any specific questions.

MR. MILLS: Are there any questions from members?

---

<sup>1</sup> In January 1996, the Council issued Order No. 672 which set a federally enforceable 90 ton per year air particulate matter emission limit for Columbia emergency power generators and an auxilliary boiler, which is below the 100 ton annual threshold for being designated as a major source and thereby being required to obtain an Air Operating Permit pursuant to federal and state regulations. Facilities that accept conditions to limit emissions below the federal/state "major source" thresholds are referred to as a "synthetic minor" source.

CHAIR LUCE: I have no questions. No Councilmembers have questions. Next, recommendations.

**MR. MILLS:** Staff would recommend that the Council approve Energy Northwest's request for a revision to their synthetic minor air permit. The last page of the package that was in your packets is an approval order form that would be signed by the Council Chair and also by the Department of Ecology, which acted on the Council's behalf in reviewing this proposal. We would recommend that the Chair be authorized to sign this revision, and I'd just note that the Department of Ecology did work with Energy Northwest and has reviewed the proposed revisions and supports the request being approved. The action would be for the Council to approve their request.

CHAIR LUCE: Do we have a motion?

**MR. FRYHLING:** I would so move.

CHAIR LUCE: Second?

**MS. TOWNE:** Second. Question for you, Mike. Is there anything in this packet indicating the Department of Ecology's work with the Applicant? I couldn't find anything and I have no reason to doubt -- or wait a minute. What's here? No, I don't see anything. Just for paper trail purposes and to keep us clean with the Feds, you probably ought to have a piece of paper from them if it's not there.

MR. MILLS: I'm personally aware that they did work with them, but we can certainly have them document that.

MS. TOWNE: Just to be tidy.

MR. MILLS: Yes, that's not a problem. We will do that.

CHAIR LUCE: We have a motion. Do we have a second to the motion?

MS. TOWNE: Yes, I seconded it.

CHAIR LUCE: You seconded it. Okay. Discussion? Do we have a call for the question?

MR. IFIE: Call for the question.

CHAIR LUCE: The question has been called for. All in favor say aye.

COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.

**CHAIR LUCE:** Motion is approved

MR. MILLS: Thank you.

## **OPERATIONS**

CHAIR LUCE: Operations.

MR. MILLS: The next item is Columbia Operations, Mot.

MR. HEDGES: The plant has been on line for 106 days. We're at 100 percent power right now, and there's nothing more than that right now.

CHAIR LUCE: Nothing more to report.

MS. TOWNE: No news is good news.

## **VISITOR'S CENTER**

CHAIR LUCE: Visitor's Center, Mike.

MR. MILLS: The Council will recall we've had discussions over the last several months about Energy Northwest's request to remove the requirement for the Visitor's Center from the site certification agreement for the Columbia Generating Station. This was discussed at the last Council meeting and Councilmembers indicated that they would like to receive some additional information and have Energy Northwest perhaps look at or consider some other alternatives and ways that they could continue to meet public outreach activities. It's not a requirement so much, but just an approach in how they can provide information about Columbia Generation Station,

their own activities, and perhaps nuclear power in general. Staff has drafted a letter that was circulated to Councilmembers this morning. I've received some comments back from members. We would accept the recommendations of the members and be prepared to have Jim sign that letter in the next day or so and then send it to Energy Northwest. I don't know if it's an action item as such, but staff would proceed with issuing that letter.

MS. TOWNE: Mr. Chair, a comment. The letter I think captures the concerns I expressed at the last meeting when this item was discussed. One premise or principle I would like to have everybody keep in mind is that we should maintain some flexibility as to how Energy Northwest will fulfill its public outreach obligation, so that we're not in the position of having to amend the SCA every two or three or five years as conditions change, demand changes, or Federal rules change. As long as the principle is stated clearly, and there is open access to whatever information is available. As long as those principles are clear and that's captured in the SCA amendment, then we don't get into this bind in the future. It's just a thought.

MR. MILLS: Yes, and we've heard that comment before.

MS. TOWNE: Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: Mike, I have one question. Has the letter been shared with Energy Northwest, our draft response?

MR. MILLS: It's not been shared. The words haven't been shared, but I had outlined some of the concerns that some Councilmembers did voice with Mot and Bill Kiel.

CHAIR LUCE: As long as Mot is here, would you share the draft letter with him before I sign it?

MR. MILLS: Yes, I will.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Is there anything else, Councilmembers, on that draft letter? Mot, if you could look at that right after this discussion because I hope to be able to sign that letter before I leave today.

MR. HEDGES: All right.

### **EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS**

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you. Emergency preparedness.

MR. MILLS: Just an update that staff has received budget proposals for fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 from the ten agencies that receive direct funding in support of offsite emergency preparedness for the Columbia Generating Station. At the next Council meeting we will bring that package to members. The action will be to approve the 2006 contract proposals, but we're looking at a four-year program package, so that everyone knows what the expectations are for that program.

MS. TOWNE: Mike, could we have that in advance of the meeting, so that we could intelligently comment upon it?

MR. MILLS: Yes, you will. I'm meeting with the Military Department lead planner. Wednesday and we're going to finalize the package, and I expect to have it to Energy Northwest next week and Councilmembers will get it at the same time.

MS. ADELSMAN: Mike, did they in the past also do a package for several years? Did they do that?

MR. MILLS: Yes. This will actually be the third four-year cycle that we're proposing. The Council has approved two previous four-year cycles.

MS. ADELSMAN: Is there a way to summarize very briefly the other two cycles, like how much?

MR. MILLS: Yes, there is, and I'll have that.

MS. ADELSMAN: Especially the last one.  
MR. MILLS: I'll include a funding data sheet.  
MS. ADELSMAN: Does the last one finish up in 2005? Is that right?  
MR. MILLS: Yes, June 30, 2005, the current fiscal year.  
MS. ADELSMAN: Thanks.

<b>WNP-1/4</b>	<b>Mike Mills, EFSEC</b>
----------------	--------------------------

#### **SITE RESTORATION**

CHAIR LUCE: WNP-1.  
MR. HEDGES: Okay. Do they have our request?  
MR. MILLS: There's a letter in your packets dated December 2, subject WNP-1/4 Site Restoration Resolution 302. They do have that, Mot.  
MR. HEDGES: This is where we are requesting the modification to the WNP-1/4 Site Restoration Plan that we talked about on October 26, about changing the final aspects of restoration, and Mr. Luce had requested some cost data. Did you do the attachments?  
MS. TOWNE: I don't have any attachments.  
MR. MILLS: We didn't have the attachments.  
MR. HEDGES: Okay. Those came over on an e-mail.  
MS. TOWNE: It's a little hard to understand what we're talking about without them.  
MR. FIKSDAL: We could jump to a different item while we're copying.  
CHAIR LUCE: Let's do that. You want to talk about off-site mitigation for a minute, Mike?  
MR. MILLS: Yes, I can.  
CHAIR LUCE: Why don't we do that, and we'll come back to site restoration.

#### **OFF-SITE MITIGATION**

MR. MILLS: As Council is aware we're in current negotiations with Benton County, City of Richland, and the Trust of Public Lands regarding the possible acquisition of the Badger Mountain property - 574 acres. I believe the Council has looked at the mountain. They've received previous reports, and we are confident that our partners in this possible acquisition are going to come up with some funds. We heard that the Friends of Badger Mountain is close to their \$75,000 goal. The City of Richland tomorrow will act on approving \$100,000 for the acquisition, and then we've heard that the Benton County budget includes \$25,000 for this project.  
CHAIR LUCE: And continuous O & M?  
MR. MILLS: Benton County will also be responsible for continuous operation and maintenance.  
CHAIR LUCE: For the life of the project, so that's kind of huge.  
MR. MILLS: So there's a very strong commitment not only from local governments in the community but also from private citizens who support this project. We expect that we will be able to get in writing that commitment by the end of this month, and then Council staff in cooperation with the 1 and 4 subcommittee will work on getting the details put together. So we are proceeding with the Badger Mountain project.  
CHAIR LUCE: Due diligence.  
MR. MILLS: The Trust for Public Land has initiated the environmental assessment, and they're also continuing to do the title work for that project.  
CHAIR LUCE: Good.  
MR. MILLS: We also, just before this Council meeting, had a meeting with representatives from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Council will continue to consult with the department as we continue to look for mitigation projects that could be supported.

CHAIR LUCE: Good.

MR. IFIE: Question?

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

MR. IFIE: Is there any progress on the Rattlesnake Slope acquisition proposal? Is that still on the table or is that off the table?

MR. MILLS: It's our understanding that that project is not on the table right now, Tony. That was based upon a report we just received today from Jeff Tayer from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and I think I would just leave it at that for now. But its staff's and Councilmembers understanding that were in the meeting that it's not on the table right now.

MR. IFIE: One more point. I know the last time we talked about this the idea, was that if the Rattlesnake Slope property was off the table that there was a potential of going out with the request for a proposal. I just want to make sure that I highlight the competition issue to think about. We should not forget about that potential.

MR. MILLS: I'll speak for them. They haven't forgotten about it. I believe our focus right now is upon the Badger Mountain, finalizing the Badger Mountain Project, and then the committee would come back to the Council and present a plan for the future.

MS. ADELSMAN: We're still talking about \$600,000 approximately for Badger Mountain or is it actually less?

MR. MILLS: \$685,000 is the figure that we've heard. I don't think they've finalized the appraisal, but they believe that's in the ball park.

MS. ADELSMAN: For the Council.

MR. MILLS: Oh, for the Council? The balance if you get \$200,000 from the locals, then you would have a balance of \$485,000 from the Council.

CHAIR LUCE: Great. Thanks, Mike.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Are we waiting for copies? I can proceed with the Chehalis project if you like.

<b><i>Chehalis Generation Facility</i></b>	<b><i>Mike Mills, EFSEC</i></b>
--	---------------------------------

MR. MILLS: I spoke with Duncan McCaig, Plant Manager for the Chehalis Generation Facility, earlier today. He said that November was a good month for the plant. Early in the month they were cycling where they'd stop in the evenings and then restart in the day. They're now in a situation where the plant is pretty much running continuous. They view it as being considered a base-load plant as the weather gets colder and we enter the winter months where they expect to run more frequently than they were earlier. They've had a good environmental and safety record during this time, and they're continuing to conduct the noise tests and make equipment improvements at the site. The other thing, and I believe Duncan spoke to this when he was here at the last meeting, but he certainly would like to have the Council come down and visit and tour the site. I believe we'll try to set that up in the month of February, if we can, where the Council could visit the site and see first hand how it operates and where you can visually see the improvements that they've made in reducing noise at the site.

CHAIR LUCE: Okay.

MR. IFIE: Question.

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

MR. IFIE: You mentioned that the environmental record at the site was good in November.

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. IFIE: What does that mean?

MR. MILLS: It means they didn't have any negative environmental findings.

CHAIR LUCE: It sounds like no complaints from the neighbors?

MR. MILLS: I think it's more than that, Tony. It's not just the noise. They do a number of environmental audits and reviews themselves at the project. It's my intent to bring a summary of their environmental compliance activities to the Council early next year, and we will provide you with a more detailed list of the items that they conduct and that we audit at the site.

MR. FIKSDAL: But I think, Tony, one of the issues early on in the construction and early operation was the runoff, storm water runoff that had some sediment in it, and that's the main concern that we remember for environmental concerns, mainly storm water runoff.

MR. IFIE: Okay. Thank you.

**WNP-1/4**

**Mike Mills, EFSEC**

**SITE RESTORATION, cont.**

CHAIR LUCE: All right. The attachments for the WNP-1 site restoration have arrived.

MR. MILLS: All right. We've got the December 2 letter and now the attachments.

MR. FIKSDAL: And then the one-page handout.

MR. MILLS: And the one-page handout on costs.

MR. HEDGES: I have Doug Culver, the Site 1 and 4 manager, here to answer any technical questions. The issue is after having done about six months of site restoration activities and getting some practical experience, we now think it would be prudent to make some modifications to the original restoration plan. In the letter I've summarized the most significant of the changes, and the first is at WNP-1, the General Services Building (GSB) structure. The original restoration agreement had us remove two of the upper elevations, so it would go from a maximum of 543 feet down to 501 feet which would still leave 46 feet above ground. To us this was -- it was designed as a seismic structure. There's just a little bit of concrete roofing that needed to be completed, and if that was finished we would have a complete seismic structure as opposed to tearing down the upper two floors. In order to do this, we would have to go in and essentially jackhammer with heavy equipment and knock down the upper walls which would tend to weaken the entire structure that would remain. We don't know that there's much from a health and safety point of view, but from an aesthetic point of view you still have the original containment that's going to be there right next to it that's significantly taller. You still have the turbine pedestal that will remain there. We don't see that there's a big aesthetic value to taking down those two upper floors, but it has a considerable expense associated with it.

A lesser amount of demolition is also proposed for the WNP-4 GSB. We were going to remove the upper two floors and take it down to the 479' elevation. On the tour you observed the upper floor has just a few walls completed. Those upper walls are removable, so we propose taking that down to the 501' elevation and then putting a roof over that instead of taking it down from 501' to 479' elevation. Again, the seismic walls are in, and in order to remove those walls they're pretty substantial. It's very costly to do that work, and it tends to weaken the remaining structure.

The same situation exists for the WNP-4 containment walls that are up. These walls are four foot thick with about 40 percent reinforced with 2 1/8 inch steel rebar. It's a significant effort to remove those walls, and there's not much of an aesthetic value gained because we still have quite a bit of height out there. So those are the major things.

Also what we would be looking at doing is advancing the final restoration status of a number of the buildings. Some of them have already been completed, but if the Council was to accept our recommendations, by the end of our near term restoration activities the WNP-1 GSB and containment buildings, and the WNP-4 containment, GSB turbine building, the circulated water



pump house and the remote air intakes, would all be at their final restoration status at this point in time next year. By next year, we could have finished the final restoration activity in all those buildings.

Now on the attachments. For Attachment A, what I tried to do is go through the original agreement and pick out all of the requirements that were in the original attachment and put down what the changes would be. And so the left column is the requirements out of the original plan, the middle column is what we would like to see in the revised plan, and the right-hand column has got various comments. Attachment B is just a summation of the work to be done at both project sites. We also did some editing. The original plan had requirements in multiple places, and there were a few inconsistencies, a lot of repetition and redundancy, and so we tried to also remove some of that repetition and redundancy and break it out separately for WNP-1 and WNP-4 to make it clear for the people doing the work what had to be done. That's my initial comments. Are there any questions?

MR. FIKSDAL: Mot, could you go over the sheet that you handed out on cost.

MR. HEDGES: Okay. In order to complete the near-term activities as requested, we have to go back to BPA and get additional funding. What we're asking for from BPA is an additional 1.16 million dollars, and that's primarily to remove the upper elevation of the WNP-4 GSB and to apply a protective coating to the roofing materials. When you were there on the visit, we were applying a metal roof to the open areas of the GSB. What we apply, well, it's a type of polyurethane-type coating to protect the concrete and the metal from weathering. It would be a long-term protective coating. For that work, we're looking at an additional 1.16 million dollars. The reduction in the work scope for final restoration -- and this gets more difficult to cost out. What we went back to was the original estimates, and these were the dollar values in there at the time for final restoration activities. The estimated savings are approximately 3.36 million to remove the upper two floors of the WNP-1 GSB and 4.79 million to lower the upper two levels of the GSB in Unit 4 and remove the walls at the Unit 4 containment.

MS. TOWNE: There must have been too many meetings this morning, but I am having trouble seeing "remove walls down to 501" in the first item as an increased work scope with intended costs and GSB lowered to 501 elevation instead of 479 as a cost savings in the last item. Now how can it be both?

MR. HEDGES: What we're doing is we're essentially moving work up from final restoration to be completed in the near term. This will be completed next year. So this is work that is not required to be done now during the near term. This was work that would have been done as part of the final restoration which is out 23 to 26 years.

MS. TOWNE: You're not reducing the work scope. You're simply changing the timing of certain elements of the final.

MR. HEDGES: Well, reducing the work scope but not lowering the height of the buildings. That's the reduction. That's the saving.

MS. TOWNE: Then you're also moving it from long term to near term.

MR. HEDGES: Yes. Some of that was scheduled to be done in the future would be moved up and some of it we're just requesting not to be done.

CHAIR LUCE: The increased work scope would have been done later in time.

MR. HEDGES: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: The reduction of work scope is just not going to be done at all for the reasons you set forth in your letter.

MR. HEDGES: Right.

CHAIR LUCE: And some of those reduction reasons are related to engineering.

MR. CULVER: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: Energy Northwest is a really great engineering --

MR. FIKSDAL: Mot, why don't you have Mr. Culver pull up a chair.

CHAIR LUCE: I want to take some time to read this and think about it a little bit, so I don't want to act on it today.

MR. HEDGES: All right.

CHAIR LUCE: But Energy Northwest is a very outstanding energy consortium, and if these were engineering concerns today, I'm surprised that they weren't considered in terms of the lengthy process we went through before this agreement was signed. There would have been engineering concerns that I would have thought that Energy Northwest would have had when they were initially going over what was going to be done to begin with because we spent a long time going over what was going to be done. So I'm a little surprised that these are newly discovered engineering reasons.

MR. HEDGES: I don't know if they're engineering reasons.

CHAIR LUCE: They were stated as such in the letter.

MR. CULVER: They are to an extent in the process. Let me just say this. We looked into the methodology of accomplishing the work in 2023 for the estimated price. You get into the fact that you really have to use some very severe mechanical methods to accomplish that task, and using those same methods to tear down the air intake structure and some of the other buildings that we have taken to final restoration, we saw what damage that did compared to those aspects that we left alone. And they were pretty devastating. And that's when we went back and started to look that if we applied that same mechanical method to tearing down the GSB structures and the containment walls, we came to the conclusion, that the result would destabilize the structures rather severely. That's why we're back to you saying that in our previous analysis we hadn't done that before, and now that we've done some of it we've realized how damaging it can be to the structures.

MS. TOWNE: Mr. Chair, I don't know who is speaking and what your role is.

MR. CULVER: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is Doug Culver, and I'm the 1 and 4 site manager. I'm also in charge of all the health and safety work going on right now.

MS. ADELSMAN: You didn't go to the tour.

MS. TOWNE: No.

CHAIR LUCE: I just would have thought these sort of engineering questions would have been thought through when you're bringing something down from a height of -- bringing something down that much, that the engineers would have looked at it to see whether this was feasible, and if not so, would have brought that up in the course of negotiations and made that argument that it was not structurally safe to do that. And we didn't hear anything like that.

MR. CULVER: I'm not sure that they had really pictured how destructive the forces would be. We got the hole ram out, and what it leaves when you're done is a pretty damaging effect.

CHAIR LUCE: Okay.

MR. IFIE: Quick question. The dollar amounts that you have in here are those in 2004 dollars?

MR. CULVER: The what?

MS. TOWNE: The dollar amounts. Are they in future amounts or are they today's value?

MR. CULVER: The \$1,160,000 is in 2004 dollars. That's today's prices to get the work done. The other two line items were directly out of the original estimate.

MR. HEDGES: Which was 1999.

MR. IFIE: Okay. Then the second question I have relates to the fact that you're not going down as much and you're stopping at 501 feet for the WNP-4 GSB. Is there any impact on the aesthetics? I was looking at your write-up. It says negligible aesthetic effects; however, I'm just curious if the definition of negligible might be different.

MR. CULVER: The reason we opted to take the walls from where they reside down to 501 feet elevation is essentially to give you the same square block look, so that there's no standing high concrete. It just ends up being essentially like the other proposal was. The GSB ends up being a square. If you get real close, you saw it's got jagged edges. From any distance it will just appear to be the same square. It's just higher than it would have been. Instead of being down to 479' it will be at 501'.

MR. FIKSDAL: What's ground level again?

MR. CULVER: 455'.

MR. HEDGES: 455' or 454'. It depends on which --

MR. FIKSDAL: It's within a foot. That's fine.

MR. HEDGES: I know at Unit 1 there's 46 feet that we're going to remain at 501'.

MR. HEDGES: So 455'.

MR. FIKSDAL: So the decrease of 16 - 20 feet or something is not too substantial, but it has some --

MR. CULVER: I want to apologize. I promised you these, and my auto CAD didn't work very well, and so I will ship you --

CHAIR LUCE: While he's looking through that, just a quick question. What was the total estimated cost for the entire restoration? We're saving basically eight million dollars by reduction of work scope. What was the total estimate of all work?

MR. HEDGES: It was 45 or 54 million.

MR. CULVER: 45 million. The original estimates for restoration for both sites was split about evenly between the sites.

CHAIR LUCE: So rounding it up, it was 45 million dollars and what you're proposing would save eight million?

MR. CULVER: Yes.

MR. IFIE: Or several million because your cost is increasing by 1.2 million.

CHAIR LUCE: No, they're going to spend that. They would be spending that anyway. That's not additional money. That money would be spent, but it would be spent on the back end.

MR. CULVER: Essentially you could take the 1.16 out of the --

CHAIR LUCE: You could take that off.

MR. CULVER: Well, you could take it out of the 4.79. The 1.16 is included.

CHAIR LUCE: All right.

MR. IFIE: So the net savings would be roughly seven million.

MR. CULVER: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: Right.

MR. CULVER: Looking at the pictures, this is the old proposal for WNP-1. This is the new proposal on WNP-1. Now, on 4, I've got to apologize. The drafter got confused. On the old proposal this should have been a flat line right in here, so this was cut off right there. And this is the new proposal with the hoops in it.

CHAIR LUCE: You will send us a new one.

MR. CULVER: I will send you a cleaned up one. I apologize. It was supposed to happen and they didn't.

MR. IFIE: So, it is your opinion is there is no impact to the public based on the changes that are being proposed?

MR. CULVER: No, I don't believe so. I mean from where the public is really going to be able to view it from they really won't be able to tell the difference. I guess if they get a transit and try and survey or something they could, but I mean from the visual eye it will be hard to really observe. It's been amazing. I will just say this for what it's worth. Since we've stripped the old forms off the outside it's hard to see the structure from a long way off. It begins to blend into the backdrop because it's just gray concrete. As we get the last of the old form stripped off it's really going to be hard to see the difference in the structure itself. It would become almost invisible. I really think that. There's a lot of people that commented at Columbia that they're beginning to see 4 go away, and we're just taking forms off. We're not tearing it down. But once you get rid of the contrast of the dark wood against the light concrete it just blends into the background.

MR. IFIE: Is there a possibility that some of the savings could be used for environmental mitigation?

MR. HEDGES: The problem is that this money is 2026 money. There is no pot right now, so that's what you get into.

MR. IFIE: The question would be is there any potential for -- I mean I'm trying to figure out how -- I wasn't in on the negotiation that occurred with you.

CHAIR LUCE: What's the question?

MR. IFIE: The question was, is there any chance that any of the money, any of the seven million dollars could be used for environmental mitigation?

CHAIR LUCE: Of course, there is.

MR. HEDGES: What there is though is there is no pot of money right now.

CHAIR LUCE: No, I totally understand that. I understand how the negotiations work, and Bonneville is going to in essence create the pot over time. That was the deal.

MR. HEDGES: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: So we need to talk about this some more, but there is a potential for that to happen. Bonneville my guess is -- it's not my guess. Bonneville is strapped financially right now, and so they are looking for ways to reduce their costs up front, and Energy Northwest is looking for ways to do work in the near term that they believe will benefit the projects. So my best guess is this is sort of a combination deal. Bonneville feels that some of these commitments to WNP-1 and 4 initiatives aren't probably necessary for structural reasons or for aesthetic reasons. You can name whatever the reasons are. So they're proposing some seven million dollars in reduction or look at it differently and not bringing the walls down as far. That helps them both now in terms of showing it on the books and long term not having to roll as much into the pot, if you will. The pot that's going to build up over the next 20 years. And Energy Northwest thinks, and as far as I know justifiably so, that putting this protective coating on WNP-4's roof is going to benefit the project now significantly. So what we got here is two people of goodwill trying to work out an arrangement and asking EFSEC to bless it. What I think we need to do is to consider a little bit about the issue you just raised. Is there something in there for mitigation for the environment? And we can't decide that today, and it really in the end I think you would agree it's really up to Bonneville to decide.

MR. CULVER: Yes.

MR. HEDGES: Yes.

MR. CULVER: It's not our money.

CHAIR LUCE: It's not our money. So I think the answer is we need to talk about it, and there's potential there.

MR. IFIE: So where do we go from here in terms of that aspect of the discussion?

MR. HEDGES: Your next meeting is --

CHAIR LUCE: January.

MR. FIKSDAL: It depends on what we decide later today.

MR. HEDGES: But anyway early January.

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

MR. HEDGES: One of the things that we're under is a time crunch on being able to let contracts to get the work done. If the Council is going to take too long to make a decision, we won't be able to do the contracts in time.

CHAIR LUCE: Understood.

MR. CULVER: We're actually going to gamble on everybody's goodwill. I'm actually writing technical specs right now, and I'm going forward with the bid process. Because it's about 45 days from the time I say go to where I can get bids in, so I'm hoping that when everybody gets around to saying yes, I am two days behind saying let's work.

CHAIR LUCE: We're going to work on this between now and the next meeting. We're probably not going to resolve it right here sitting at this table today. Yes Hedia.

MS. ADELSMAN: I know we're talking about maybe some savings. My interest is what are the criteria for us to say yes on this one? We have an existing restoration plan. We have an amendment, and, yes, money is an issue. But what are some of the criteria? Are the criteria technical? Are there certain things that we should be concerned about or is it just a matter that this is an amendment based on the company saying that this is the best way for them to achieve what they want to achieve? I mean the side benefit and the discussion relating to do with the money, whose money and so on, is really as far as I'm concerned a side discussion on this compared to should we redo this based on the proposal that's being submitted and based on the engineering and the technical merits and so on. It's not a matter of leveraging the dollars. At least that's how I see it. It's not a question for us to say, yes, we go with this if we get five million dollars. Is this proposal a good restoration amendment that we should approve based on the technical justification that they have provided us?

CHAIR LUCE: I guess I would ask you and Tony, you're an engineer, right?

MR. IFIE: I used to be.

CHAIR LUCE: You're still an engineer; to work with Mike on this and get together after this Council meeting today and discuss those substantive issues.

MR. IFIE: I was just going to make one comment. What are the advantages of this new proposal? Certainly previously it was something that was going to be done in the future. Nobody was sure if it was really going to happen, but it's happening right now. That's a big plus. It's actually happened is one. Number two is it's been done at a savings. It's good government to not waste our public funds. This way it's been done at the lesser cost, and I say that is good. I was looking for a downside. I haven't seen one yet. I was thinking about the aesthetic problems, but from looking at the pictures here so far I have not been able to see any aesthetic issues.

MR. HEDGES: Doug and I, neither of us were involved in the earlier thing, and I'm not sure what the thoughts were back when those people came up with these. But once you actually get into the work, and you see that heavy equipment beating walls down even like the air intakes, which is a building about the size of this room, with the heavy concrete walls it took that one

piece of heavy equipment a week to break down a room this size because it was seismically reinforced concrete.

MR. MILLS: Hedia, in response to Hedia's question, there was an extensive effort by Energy Northwest and consultants in looking at the near-term and the long-term work, so there is criteria that was applied to particularly the near term public health and safety work, and I believe that's -- I'm not sure it's documented in the '99 plan, but I believe it is at least summarized to some extent the criteria that Energy Northwest applied to the safety work. And certain work came out on top to be done first. So I believe we can document that and go back and provide information for members to look at and become more familiar with the thinking that went into this near-term work, and it was criteria, and it was from a safety and environmental benefit.

CHAIR LUCE: We front loaded the health and safety issues.

MR. MILLS: That's why we're doing it now and it's supposed to be done in 18 – 24 months.

CHAIR LUCE: Energy Northwest, I want to just compliment you. You've done an outstanding job. When we were over there, I did not recognize the same site that I had visited six months ago. So my hat is off to all of you for having done the super job that you've done. I think I understand the interests at work here, and I also understand that you've got to have a decision soon. So what I would ask again is Hedia that you and Tony and Mike get together, take a look at these criteria. And I'm going to be -- I may not be here forever depending on who the governor is or if we ever have a governor.

MR. FIKSDAL: Forever? You're planning on being here forever?

CHAIR LUCE: Sorry. I wouldn't inflict that on staff. But we will get this resolved, and we will get this resolved in a timely manner, so that you can get done what you need to have done and keep running those specs.

MS. ADELSMAN: Jim, are you saying that we should be able to make a decision at the next meeting on this?

CHAIR LUCE: Yes.

MS. ADELSMAN: Okay.

MR. HEDGES: To follow up your question, if you go back to the original estimates what they did is they came up with a whole spectrum of proposals. They had a contractor that helped them, and it ranged anywhere from doing just some minimal near-term stuff up to making a green field which was well over 100 million dollars, the cost estimate for doing that. I'm not sure how they came up with the decision to pick this one, but anyway there was a spectrum of about ten different options that they came up with.

MR. MILLS: And the plan is called 3D.

MR. HEDGES: Well, there was like Proposal 1, 2, 3, 3A, B, C, D, E, F, and then there was a 4 and 5.

CHAIR LUCE: Hedia, you may not have been here, but if you look at our WACs, the WACs say in essence with respect to the nuclear plants they go to sagebrush and bunny rabbits down to ground zero unless the buildings can be preserved for economic purposes.

MR. FIKSDAL: Or at the Council's discretion.

CHAIR LUCE: Or at the Council's discretion. So our opening position was take them to sagebrush and bunny rabbits except for economic purposes, and the burden is on Energy Northwest to show the economic purposes. Then we got into it, and they made, Bonneville made an argument that, hey, there's no economic good reason to do that. So we talked a lot, and at the end we came out here. Were there measurable criteria as to why we came out here? No, there

were not. And quite frankly there won't be any measurable criteria in the scientific sense of the words as to how we come out here except for health and safety on the front end.

MS. ADELSMAN: I just wanted to clarify my comments. I'm comfortable with the changes that are being submitted, and I'm comfortable moving ahead. I'm just more concerned about the size of the conversation about money and future mitigation and all of that and thinking is it part of our criteria or is that a side benefit that we could negotiate later on? That was my only comment. What are we going to base our decision on? Mostly on the technical or is it on trying to get more money for mitigation?

CHAIR LUCE: Well, I always like getting money for mitigation. I never want to give that up.

MS. ADELSMAN: I know.

CHAIR LUCE: One possible option, the immediacy is the cost increase for the protective coating of WNP-4 roofing material. That's the immediacy. These other issues don't have to be as far as I can see immediately. Bonneville would like them resolved immediately, correct?

MR. CULVER: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: They don't have to be done by January 6. They should be. I mean you would like them to have it, but they're not going to be done right away anyway. They're going to be done sometime out in the future. So what we do need to resolve by January 6, by the first of January, what you're writing specs on, which is the roof.

MR. CULVER: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: So I would ask Councilmembers to keep that in mind. This is a full package, but just because it's written down as a full package doesn't mean that the full package has to be decided. What needs to be decided is \$1,160,000 for this roofing material, so that's what we've got to drill down on. That's what we need money out of Bonneville's pocket for, so that Energy Northwest can do what they need to do. That reserves to a later date perhaps I'm saying not absolutely, but perhaps the final restoration questions of how far down does the WNP-1 and 4 height elevation come on these other two areas. Maybe the Council needs to think about that a little more, talk about whether there's any mitigation there.

MR. FIKSDAL: Is that really true or do you have the equipment out there that you would do that now rather than later?

MR. CULVER: The 1.6 million includes tearing walls down to 501'.

MS. ADELSMAN: Not to 479'.

MR. CULVER: Not to 479'.

MS. TOWNE: It's 1.160 million.

MR. HEDGES: We have to get the crane and the people out there because that wall section there is one foot thick, and that can be cut.

MR. FIKSDAL: Let's put it this way for our discussion. If the Council were to reject your proposal, say we want the walls taken down to 479', what would that mean?

MR. CULVER: That would mean I would continue with health and safety, and I'll put on the metal roofs, and I won't cut any walls down, and we'll finish up the health and safety work.

MS. ADELSMAN: For the near term.

MR. CULVER: For the near term.

MS. ADELSMAN: And you wait until the long term to decide whether to come back again.

MR. HEDGES: And then there will be somebody else here.

CHAIR LUCE: That's probably true of all of us. But, again, if you got the 1.160 million, you could do the roof now.

MR. CULVER: Yes, we could do the roof and cut walls down to 501' now.

CHAIR LUCE: You could do that now with the 1.160 million.

MR. CULVER: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: And you don't need the 3.361 million or 4.790 million right now.

MR. IFIE: Those are savings.

CHAIR LUCE: Savings. Okay.

MR. CULVER: They're deductions from future costs.

MS. TOWNE: The fourth savings item, the bottom, GSB lowered to 501' that's factored into the 4.790 million savings, that piece of the 1.160 million.

CHAIR LUCE: We really have to decide the whole thing by then.

MS. TOWNE: Mr. Chair, I am prepared to move that we accept this plan and act on it as to the removal of walls down to 501' and apply the protective coating. What more are we going to know or need to know to make that decision?

MR. FRYHLING: And I will second it.

MS. TOWNE: It doesn't seem very complicated.

CHAIR LUCE: I would like to talk to Bonneville about some potential benefits.

MS. TOWNE: I have a second, so let me add a discussion.

MR. FIKSDAL: Mr. Chairman, before you go forward, we don't have it marked as an action item on the agenda.

MS. TOWNE: Well, we can have a meeting on the 16th by phone and decide it.

MR. FIKSDAL: You could easily say at your next meeting this is how you're thinking of voting.

MS. TOWNE: No, I'm saying let's just do it.

MR. FIKSDAL: You can't just do it.

MS. TOWNE: We can do it on the 16th or whatever that date is, the 20th, by phone.

MR. FIKSDAL: Or whichever date you choose to do it by phone.

MS. TOWNE: Which would give everybody time to read their packets and everything else.

CHAIR LUCE: That's always helpful to have information and have a chance to read it instead of just doing it.

MS. TOWNE: Yes, I know.

MS. ADELSMAN: I was ready to do it too.

MS. TOWNE: I always want to grasp at whatever money is available to mitigate whatever, but what are we mitigating? As I understand it, when we issue an SCA or a recommendation for approval for an SCA we have considered that which needs to be mitigated and impose those requirements on the permittee to do those mitigations. Is there evidence in the packet or elsewhere that there is more to be mitigated than we knew about when we set the original mitigation package? If not, how can we spend anybody's savings on mitigation when there's no mitigation need indicated in the record? I'm just posing the question, and I'm as greedy as anybody on buying more sagebrush.

MR. IFIE: Let me play the role of advocate. I think we need more time to read the material, to go over the material. Also we need to figure out if there's any downside to the proposal.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

MR. IFIE: This is the first time it was seen the entire package like this, so I think --

MS. ADELSMAN: And the downside is technical engineering or is it economic?

MR. IFIE: It could be technical because, for instance, the issue of that aesthetic, we're going to get this information, the CAD drawings.

MR. CULVER: You have those, but what essentially happened is --

MR. IFIE: You're going to be clarifying this.



MR. CULVER: Referring to the pictures, that would be cut off, that would be cut off, and that will be cut off.

MR. IFIE: But that will help us to figure out, is there any visual impacts? Maybe that's all the impacts that we should be looking at. So I think, Hedia, you've come up with a good point about what's the criteria. We need to go back and look at the original documents to see what criteria was agreed upon.

MS. TOWNE: All right. With permission of my seconder, I will withdraw my motion.

MR. FRYHLING: I withdraw my second.

MR. MILLS: I will be over at the site Wednesday. If you could have pictures available then, and Mot's included in that meeting that I'll be in. I'll bring those back, and I'll put together a packet for the Councilmembers and try to have that out to you by the end of the week. It will have the additional information on the original plan, and I think we'll find that criteria that you're looking for there.

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes, and I think Jim's idea is a good idea. We can, Tony, myself, and you, meet and put something together for the rest of the members, and we could be ready for the next meeting.

CHAIR LUCE: Thank you.

MR. MILLS: So I will develop a package and then meet with you and Tony and take a look at it.

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes.

CHAIR LUCE: Anything else to discuss on WNP-1 and 4 mitigation? Excuse me. WNP-1 and 4 site restoration. We've already discussed off-site mitigation. Thanks for your report.

MR. IFIE: Thank you.

CHAIR LUCE: We will make your date, so keep writing those specs. We may meet in the next 48 hours depending on the circumstances.

## **ITEM NO. 6: EFSEC RULES**

<b><i>Rules Update</i></b>	<b><i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager</i></b>
----------------------------	--

CHAIR LUCE: Okay. EFSEC rules update, Allen.

MR. FIKSDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you know the rules revision became effective on November 11 of last month. We are putting together this new rules booklet, and we'll probably get that to the printer maybe by this week, so we can issue those. Then we will be sending out all the information about that.

CHAIR LUCE: Great.

MR. FIKSDAL: So we're essentially done except for the printing is what that amounts to.

CHAIR LUCE: We are going to have all the WACs in there, both procedural WACs and substantive WACs.

MR. FIKSDAL: Every WAC that we own, yes, is in there.

MS. ADELSMAN: Even the ones we didn't amend.

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes, this will be the effective WACs.

MS. TOWNE: The full meal deal for all new applicants.

MR. FIKSDAL: For everything under Title 463. We will also probably at the same time have printed the laws again in another booklet, so everything is updated and within the laws or the attachment we'll have the CO2 laws printed up with it.

CHAIR LUCE: Excellent.

MR. FIKSDAL: So within the next couple weeks we'll hopefully have that all done.

<b><i>CR-101 Air Rules Revisions</i></b>
--

<b><i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i></b>
------------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: CR 101 air rules revisions. I understand we're on the firing line again.

MS. MAKAROW: Yes, again. In 2003, Ecology started some more rule revisions of their air rules because of changes in the Federal PSD program, and as a result of that about a month ago they issued a CR 102 with their proposed revisions, and they're going through the public process on that. They are not only changing the substantive requirements for review, but they're also shuffling their WACs around. So that means that our adoption of their WACs is going to have to change, and this is just the kick off for that process to allow me to then start working on those revisions.

CHAIR LUCE: Great.

**MR. FIKSDAL: So the CR 101, we're looking for Council approval for us to issue that and begin that process.**

CHAIR LUCE: That is an action item. Do we have a motion?

**MS. TOWNE: So move.**

CHAIR LUCE: Second?

**MR. IFIE: Second.**

CHAIR LUCE: Council discussion. Hearing no discussion, Council question?

MS. ADELSMAN: The SEPA I'm assuming is just the DNS.

MR. FIKSDAL: We will have to do a DNS.

CHAIR LUCE: The question has been called for. All in favor say aye.

**COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.**

<b><i>Future Rule Additions</i></b>
-------------------------------------

<b><i>Tony Ifie, DNR</i></b>
------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: Tony, future rule additions.

MR. IFIE: Yes, this is short. This has come up and has been coming up for a while. We've been talking about it. We completed the first round of rules. During the time when we're considering the rules, we didn't want to go into rules that will take too long to process, so we took the easy ones.

MS. TOWNE: You could have fooled me.

CHAIR LUCE: Easy?

MR. IFIE: I should not say easy. We took the ones that could be accomplished within the time frame that the Council thought was reasonable at that time.

CHAIR LUCE: Three years.

MR. IFIE: So now that we are done with that effort it would make sense to look back and figure out what are some rules that have given us stumbling blocks that we could work on. An example of that is land use. We are having some issues with land use.

MS. ADELSMAN: Do you mean the preemption?

MR. IFIE: The preemption. So we look back and say, "Okay, what are some rules that we can target for a situation in the future?" I think at one time we discussed it, and I believe Allen was going to take a look and come back to the Council.

MS. TOWNE: And Chuck Carelli was assembling a list.

MR. FIKSDAL: I recall that we several times said we're not going to deal with it right now. We'll put those off. We'll have to put together a list. If you have any suggestions and each of you may recall specifics that you had or thought of that you thought maybe should be revised but we didn't do it, we would be more than happy to hear it. I'll start putting together something, and that will be the list that we should start looking at in 2005.

MS. ADELSMAN: Allen, the biggest problem we had before is the funding, of course, and we agreed that the rules aren't going to come out of the Columbia fees and others, and we put in a budget request. I'm assuming that more likely it will be this Governor's budget, and we don't know where it's going to go; is that right?

MR. FIKSDAL: That's correct. We haven't seen the Governor's budget. The EFSEC budget request will be in the CTED request. That CTED request to the Governor is \$150,000 to promulgate rules as required by the CO2 mitigation law, RCW 80.70. We had another \$100,000 for other items that EFSEC may want to do, but I wouldn't view this as you need some specific funding for rule making. I think this is part of the normal work and ongoing work of the Council to look at rules. I'm not looking at this as a --

MS. ADELSMAN: Three year.

MR. FIKSDAL: -- three-year Council concerted effort. I think this is just kind of an ongoing --  
MR. IFIE: Incidental.

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes, incidental look at what rules may need to be revised, updated that we haven't done yet. Maybe take one chapter at a time over a course of a few months and look at that. So it's not a year long or more project. I think we just need at least to begin with what Tony's suggesting, get a list of what we think could be looked at. And then from that list maybe we look at exactly which chapters you want to tackle first and how long you want to take and which is the most important. So this isn't something that I think we are going to be advertising as was the standards rule making. This is ongoing maintenance of the Council rules.

MR. FRYHLING: Does that include amending the law that we operate under?

MR. FIKSDAL: No, unless the Council wants to.

MR. FRYHLING: I think we addressed the land use issue. There's not a lot to revise in the rules unless we amend the law. At least that's my feeling anyway. Right? Do you think so?

MS. ADELSMAN: Yes.

MS. TOWNE: I agree.

MS. ADELSMAN: They're outdated.

MR. FIKSDAL: If you have any suggestions of what chapters we might look at.

MS. TOWNE: You may want to look, Allen, at agendas for the coming year allocating a spot for rules, and then as we find things of interest or we want to assign to a subcommittee or something on a monthly basis we can do that. So it isn't an onerous burden that is suddenly looming in our faces, but is the normal course of business.

MR. FIKSDAL: Right.

MS. TOWNE: We tend to our rules.

MR. FIKSDAL: Good suggestion.

MR. IFIE: Last comment on this. So what is the next action? Are we going to have a report from you, Allen, in two months, three months, six months?

MR. FIKSDAL: I think at, let's say the February meeting I'll come back with a list that I've prepared with input from you all.

MS. TOWNE: And Chuck's list.

MR. FIKSDAL: And Chuck's list. Then we can decide. You can decide what you want to do with it. You can set priorities, set a small committee. Then we can see the extent of it to begin with. I think that's what you want to see to begin with. Then you decide how you want to parse it out.

MR. IFIE: That sounds good. Thank you.

MS. TOWNE: And I will say once more with feeling as the rules get published we are going to get the word out that our new rules are available and thank all the people we should be thanking, and that's that other project that can get tended to in January or something.

MR. FIKSDAL: I'll start in December as soon as we get published and start that process.

MS. TOWNE: Yes.

## ITEM NO. 7: 2005 MEETING SCHEDULE

<b><i>Adoption of 2005 Meeting Schedule</i></b>	<b><i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager</i></b>
---	--

CHAIR LUCE: 2005 meeting schedule. Allen, you have a recommendation.

MR. FIKSDAL: Yes, I do. In the back of your packets you have a couple pieces of paper. One is kind of a buff color or beige, or whatever color that is. It's a calendar. Then a salmon color which is your rules that became effective in November, and you'll look at the rules basically say that on or before January of each year you will publish in the state register the list of dates for your meetings of that year. My proposal to you or I'll suggest that the Council meet every second Tuesday of each month in the year 2005. In this calendar you have one side that says the second Monday. That was going to be my first recommendation until I thought the second Tuesday would be even better. So that's the second side. So you can see what dates the meetings would be. Each of those dates, either the second Monday or second Tuesday, does not coincide with a holiday, which is the grayed out area in these calendars. But I think on staff's behalf Tuesday may be easier than Monday. It gives us another day of preparation time and whatnot. Mondays have been traditional for the Council, but if I recall correctly a lot of those Mondays were because many of the Councilmembers had staff meetings on Tuesdays back in the olden days. So we could choose any day you want. They're all technically special meetings. But according to your rules you have to list when you think you're going to have those special meetings in the state register. We have to get the information to the register by the 8th of December to be published in the register on or about the 5th of January.

MS. TOWNE: And that's the day after tomorrow.

**MR. FIKSDAL: My recommendation is the second Tuesday of each month in 2005.**

**MS. TOWNE: So moved.** Do I have a second?

**MR. FRYHLING: I'll second it.**

CHAIR LUCE: Now we can have Council discussion.

MR. IFIE: Does anybody have staff meetings on Tuesdays apart from me?

MS. ADELSMAN: No, I have it on Monday.

MR. IFIE: I'm going to have to move mine to Monday. No problem. I don't have any other comments.

CHAIR LUCE: We've had a motion, a second. We've had a discussion. Call for the question.

MR. FRYHLING: We haven't asked Darrel. Darrel comes to every meeting we've ever had.

MR. PEEPLES: Mondays it's hard to wake up. I like Tuesdays.

MS. TOWNE: And this is guaranteed to put you back to sleep. I knew you were thinking that.

MR. FIKSDAL: Again, we will continue at the 1:30 hour for the beginning.

CHAIR LUCE: Question has been called for. All in favor say aye.

**COUNCILMEMBERS: Aye.**

CHAIR LUCE: Tuesday it is.

## ITEM NO. 8: OTHER

<b><i>SIP/Submittal to EPA Region 10</i></b>	<b><i>Irina Makarow, EFSEC</i></b>
--	------------------------------------

CHAIR LUCE: Under Other, the SIP/Submittal to EPA Region 10, Irina.

MS. MAKAROW: Just a very brief note to let you know that we'll be getting our packets to Ecology sometime early next week, and I'll be able to forward that onto EPA Region 10, and that will close that file for now.

MS. TOWNE: Hurrah. Congratulations.

<b><i>Chair's last meeting</i></b>	<b><i>Allen Fiksdal, EFSEC Manager</i></b>
------------------------------------	--

MR. FIKSDAL: I have one other. I guess it's more of a technical.

CHAIR LUCE: Sure.

MR. FIKSDAL: Now that you have chosen the second Tuesday of each month your next meeting will be January 11, 2005, and not knowing who's going to be Governor and not knowing who the next Chair will be, that will be Chair Luce's last meeting unless he is reappointed between now and then.

CHAIR LUCE: Or after, whenever.

MS. TOWNE: Well, he can't be reappointed until the new Governor shows up which is the next day, the 12th I believe.

CHAIR LUCE: It will be my last meeting under Governor Locke or perhaps ever at all.

MR. FIKSDAL: But the Chair's position is co-extensive as it says in the law with the Governor.

CHAIR LUCE: I turn into a pumpkin with Governor Locke.

MR. IFIE: One comment to change the subject to a more exciting subject. Between now and the next meeting there will be a lot of holidays coming up, so I want to wish everybody a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.

MR. FRYHLING: Happy holidays.

## ITEM NO. 9: ADJOURN

CHAIR LUCE: All right. Is there anything else for the good of the order?

MR. FRYHLING: Adjourn for the good of the order.

CHAIR LUCE: Adjourn for the good of the order.

(Council meeting adjourned at 2:44 p.m.)